



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/632,261	08/01/2003	Kent Charles Burr	129640-1	5497
6147	7590	12/04/2008		
GENERAL ELECTRIC COMPANY			EXAMINER	
GLOBAL RESEARCH			VARGOT, MATHIEU D	
PATENT DOCKET RM. BLDG. K1-4A59				
NISKAYUNA, NY 12309			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1791	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/04/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ldocket@crd.ge.com
rosssr@crd.ge.com
parkskl@crd.ge.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/632,261	BURR, KENT CHARLES	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Mathieu D. Vargot	1791	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 August 2008.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-31 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-25 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 26-31 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: _____.

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 25-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Corbeil et al in view of either of Mir et al (see col. 8, line 61 through col. 9, line 14) or Borelli et al (see col. 1, lines 37-38; col. 7, lines 51-61).

Corbeil et al is applied for reasons of record, the primary reference teaching the basic claimed scintillator lacking essentially that the laser forms a scintillator material having a second optical property—ie, in Corbeil et al, the laser forms a microvoid rather than a material with a changed optical property. Either of Mir et al or Borelli et al disclose making waveguides in ceramic or glass material by using a laser to selectively densify certain discrete portions so irradiated so that the laser treated portions become crystalline in an otherwise non-crystalline material. Since the basic function of a scintillator element is that of a waveguide—ie, to guide photons—it is submitted that one of ordinary skill in the art would have knowledge of the methods used in the secondary references to selectively pattern a scintillator element. The secondary references are directed to making waveguides. While Corbeil et al uses the laser to remove material at discrete spots, Borelli et al (see col. 1, lines 37-38) teaches this use as well as effecting a refractive index change (ie, densification or crystallization) in the material. Clearly, either is known in the art and the exact effect the laser would have on the material would depend on the intensity of the laser and duration of treatment. It would have

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the scintillator of the primary reference by effecting an optical property change in the material rather than by removing the material dependent on the exact method desired to perform the patterning. Clearly, both are known. The removal of the material would require more intense heating and higher operational costs, as well as possibly scorching the remainder of the scintillator. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been led to perform the less drastic heating taught in the secondary references to avoid these problems.

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 25-31 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

In view of the amendment, the references to Mir et al and Borelli et al have been reemployed in the rejection. Essentially, this same rejection was advanced against then pending claims 26-33 in the final rejection of November 29, 2007 and is submitted to still be a valid rejection. Whether the material is removed (as in Corbeil et al) or changed in optical property (as in the secondary references), it is clear that the path of the photons would be changed at the boundary points.

3. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mathieu D. Vargot whose telephone number is 571 272-1211. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri from 9 to 6.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christina Johnson, can be reached on 571 272-1176. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

M. Vargot
November 21, 2008

/Mathieu D. Vargot/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1791